DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 581 CS 213 639

AUTHOR Knudson, Ruth E.
TITLE An Analysis of Persuasive Discourse: Learning How To Take a Stand.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (42nd, San Antonio, TX, December 2-5, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; *Classification; Discourse Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Persuasive Discourse; Sex Differences; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS California (South); Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the effects of instruction on students' persuasive writing at two grade levels (third and fifth), and determined the categories and types of written persuasion used by students at four grade levels (3rd, 5th, 10th, and 12th). The first objective, determining instructional effects, was accomplished by specifically instructing 139 students in 8 classes in a southern California school in oral and written argument/persuasion. There were no significant main effects for instructional strategy or for the presence of the oral interaction component. The second purpose of the study (to categorize persuasive responses from 308 students and to determine age and gender differences, if any) was addressed using D. M. Weiss and J. Sachs' (1991) classification system. There was no significant main effect for gender, but there was a significant main effect for age. Students in grade 3 did not use compromise at all, while 11.1% of the 12th grade students' responses were compromise. Simple statements were used more by students in grade 3 than by students in grades 5, 10, or 12. There were also differences in the types of responses by grade level. (Two tables of data are included; 21 references and 2 appendixes, presenting the scoring guide and a description of persuasive categories, are attached.) (Author/SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353581

An Analysis of Persuasive Discourse: Learning How to Take a Stand

Ruth E. Knudson
School of Education
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California 92521

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ruth E. Knudson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the National Reading Conference
San Antonio, Texas
December 1992

CS213639

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this study is twofold: (1) to determine the effects of instruction on students' persuasive writing at two grade levels (third and fifth); and (2) to determine the categories and types of written persuasion used by students at four grade levels (third, fifth, tenth, and twelfth). The first objective, determining instructional effects, was accomplished by specifically instructing students in oral and written argument/ persuasion. There were no significant main effects for instructional strategy or for the presence of the oral interaction component.

The second purpose of this study is to categorize students' persuasive responses and to determine age and gender differences, if any, in the nature of the responses given. Weiss and Sachs' (1991) classification system was used. There was no significant main effect for gender, but there was a significant main effect for age. Students in grade 3 did not use Compromise at all while 11.1% of the twelfth grade students' responses were Compromise. Simple Statements were used more by students in Grade 3 than by students in Grades 5, 10, or 12. There were also differences in the Types of responses by grade level.

An Analysis of Persuasive Discourse:
Learning How to Take a Stand

Argument is a complex activity, one which frequently incorporates many of the other writing tasks stressed in a composition course. Very little attention is paid in the curriculum to the explicit teaching of certain genres, including argument. McCann (1989) points out that elementary school curricula avoid argumentative and persuasive writing tasks and that secondary school composition textbook series typically avoid argument until eleventh grade.

Lemke (1988) notes that mastery of certain genres and thematic formations confers power in our society. Most of these have both spoken and written variants that must be mastered. Among the elementary genres most often considered central are Descriptions, Comparisons, Hypotheses, Procedural Instructions, Thesis-and-Evidence Arguments, Thesis-and-Logical-Consequence Arguments and so forth, while other genres are a bit more complex (e.g., the Research Proposal, the Persuasive Essay, the Oral Presentation) (Lemke, 1988).

Some students pick up the rules of these genres without explicit instruction. However, the mastery of something as essential as formal genres needs to be insured for all students. One of the genres which is essential for full participation in society is argumentation/persuasion.

The most effective methods of teaching argument and persuasion, in writing and in speech, have not been identified. In fact, it is not yet agreed that the teaching of persuasion and logical argument can be combined effectively. We have not yet identified the elements of logic or the types of evidence or documentation which should be introduced. Nor do we know to what extent the learning of persuasion and argumentation depends on the maturation of the child (development of logical thinking, formal reasoning) or on instruction delivered to the child (Veal & Tillman, 1971; Anderson & Bashaw, 1968; Knudson, 1988, 1991).

It is known that children frequently have difficulty with both oral and written arguments (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1982). Erftmier (1985) concluded that children cannot simply transfer persuasive strategies used in oral dialogue to written monologues, and they do not have a well-developed schema for written persuasion. Flavell, Botkin, Fry, Wright, and Jarvis (1968) examined the persuasive oral strategies of children in grades 3, 7, and 11 who role-played two persuasive situations. They found that most of the appeals used by the children were of a high pressure/hard sell type. The messages became relatively softer with age. Clark and Delia (1976) investigated the perspective-taking ability level of children in grades 2 through 9. They concluded that higher-order strategies were used by the older children and that the more mature children employed

a set of persuasive strategies which reflected a more sophisticated ability to understand and adapt to the perspective of the other.

Pellegrini, Galda, and Rubin (1984) used Clark and Delia's classification system to examine the persuasive messages of first-, third-, and fifth- grade children orally and in writing. They found that messages became longer, more varied, and more complex with age. Weiss and Sachs (1991) explored the characteristics of oral persuasion in preschoolers. They coded the children's persuasive statements into 23 strategies/ categories forming five statement types: Norm Invocation, Positive Sanction, Negative Sanction, Request, and Assertion. As children became older, they increased their use of Positive Sanction and reduced dependence on Assertion. Boys used Norm Invocation more than girls did, while girls used Requests more than boys did. Of the individual strategies/categories, the most frequent were Bargains and Guarantees. (See Appendix B.)

Students' written competence is examined and reported through the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). NAEP results (Applebee, Langer, Jenkins, Mullis, & Foertsch, 1990) indicate that student performance on persuasive writing tasks is poor. Across grades four to twelve, 65 to 88 percent of the students give minimal or better responses to persuasive tasks requiring them to convince others of a particular point of view, while only 27 to 36 percent give adequate or better responses. On the tasks requiring refutation of a position or point of view, 46 to 69 percent write minimal or better responses and 14 to 36 percent write adequate or elaborated responses. Applebee et al. (1990) conclude that many students do not possess well-developed persuasive writing abilities, skills that are probably going to be important to students in both their personal and their work lives.

It should be noted that the 1990 results appear to be an improvement over the 1986 NAEP results (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1986). However, there was a distinct change in persuasive writing prompts from 1986 to 1990, one which points to the difficulty students have with persuasive writing. The 1986 prompts require students to both take a stand and refute the opposition in the same essay while the 1990 prompts require students to take a stand in one essay and refute the opposition in a separate essay. Only thirty-six percent of eleventh grade students, across eleven tasks of varying difficulty, write persuasively at the minimal level or better. Fourth grade students also perform poorly on these tasks. Between 27 and 47 percent write unsatisfactory papers and fewer than two percent write elaborated papers. Thus, the apparent improvement in student performance on persuasive writing tasks from the 1986 report to the 1990 report is explained in large part by the change in writing prompts.

The above conclusion, that the 1990 task is easier than the 1986 task, is supported by two studies recently conducted with persuasive writing (Knudson, 1992, In press). These studies describe the differences among student writing at two grade levels (tenth and twelfth) at three points in time (Knudson, 1991) and at four grade levels (fourth, sixth, tenth, and twelfth) at two points in time (Knudson, In Press). Results of these studies indicate that few students include a response to the opposition or acknowledgement of opposition in their essays at either grade level, even though these elements are usually considered to be components of effective argument.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold: (1) to determine the effects of instruction on students' persuasive writing at two grade levels; and (2) to determine the categories and types of persuasion used by students at four grade levels.

The first objective, determining instructional effects, was accomplished by specifically instructing students in oral and written argument/persuasion. The four methods of instruction were selected, in part, based on Hillocks' (1984; 1986) meta-analysis of the effectiveness of instructional strategies in teaching writing. He identified six instructional foci of research studies: grammar, sentence combining, model compositions, scales and guided revision to guide writing and revision, inquiry and free writing. In addition to the six foci, Hillocks identified four modes of instruction. While the foci are the dominant content of instruction, the modes refer to the role of the classroom teacher, the kinds and order of activities present, and the nature (specificity and clarity) of objectives and learning tasks.

The four modes of instruction include: (1) presentational; (b) natural process; (c) environmental; and (d) individualized. The presentational mode is dominated by teacher-led discussion and lecture; feedback comes from the teacher in written comments. The natural process mode focuses on free writing with feedback from the teacher as facilitator and from other students. Models or criteria are seldom if ever used. The environmental mode involves peer-group activity with highly structured problem-solving tasks. The individualized mode consists primarily of teacher-student conferences or programmed materials. The modes and foci of instruction are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, it is not possible to say that the presence or absence of significant results depends entirely on either the foci or mode of instruction since it is possible that the results arise from an interaction of foci and mode (Knudson, 1992).

Results of earlier studies (Knudson, 1991; In press) indicate that instruction with the four instructional strategies named earlier (models, scales/questions/criteria, models and

scales/questions/criteria, and free writing) are not effective in teaching persuasive writing to students in grades four to twelve. However, instruction in these previous studies was delivered through textual material presented to the students with no interaction with the teacher or with other students. The purpose of this study is to test the effectiveness of these strategies when the mode of instruction is changed. In other words, the element of teacher-student and student-student interaction has been added to this experiment.

The second purpose of this study is to categorize students' persuasive responses and to determine age and gender differences, if any, in the nature of the responses given. A classification system similar to the one used by Weiss and Sachs (1991) is used. There are noticeable differences between the Weiss and Sachs study and this one. First, the children in the Weiss and Sachs study are preschoolers; the students in this study are in grades three, five, ten, and twelve. Second, the classification of persuasive statements in Weiss and Sachs' study was applied to children's oral production of persuasion; in this study, the classification of statements is applied to students' written production.

METHOD

INSTRUCTIONAL INTERVENTION

Subjects

One hundred thirty-nine students in eight classes were present for all three writing prompts and at least ten of the fourteen days of instruction. Seventy-three students were in Grade 3 and 66 in Grade 5. Seventy-two were boys and 67 were girls. All students attended a K-6 public elementary school in the high desert area of southern California.

Design

This study employed a repeated-measures, 2 (Oral Interaction) x 4 (Treatment) x 2 (Grade) x 3 (Time of Measurement) design. The four levels of treatment included in the analysis were as follows: (a) presentation of model pieces of writing, (b) presentation of scales/questions/criteria to guide writing and revision, (c) presentation of models and scales/questions/criteria, and (d) free writing. (See Instructional Groups below for a more detailed description.) The oral interaction component was either presence or absence of oral interaction. Grade levels were 3 and 5. Times of measurement were Writing Sample 1, before the study started; Writing Sample 2, at the conclusion of treatment; and Writing Sample 3, 2 weeks after the study was completed.

Instructional Groups

The students were randomly assigned to instructional groups within grade level. Each treatment group received a specific instructional strategy. The instructional strategy was presented in the written-pictorial material given to each student each day for 14 days. Students in Treatment Group 1 were instructed with model pieces of writing and given opportunities to write. Students in Treatment Group 2 were given scales, questions, and criteria to guide their writing and revision. Students in Treatment Group 3 were instructed with both model pieces of writing and scales/questions/criteria. Students in Treatment Group 4 had opportunities to write but no instruction in argumentative writing. One classroom at each grade level was randomly selected to receive only textual instruction. As in every other classroom, all four treatments were present in these two classrooms. These two classrooms served essentially as a control for the other classrooms, all of which received oral interaction and instruction with the teacher as well as textual instruction. These two text-only classrooms served as a control since this method of instruction with persuasive writing has previously been demonstrated not to be effective in improving students' persuasive writing. Thus, it was possible to determine the effectiveness of the four instructional strategies with and without oral instruction and interaction.

Procedures

Before the study started (Writing Prompt 1), at the end of the study (Writing Prompt 2), and again 2 weeks after the completion of the study (Writing Prompt 3), writing samples were collected from all the students. The test samples of writing were collected under uniform conditions. Treatment variations did not apply to the production of the samples.

Writing Prompts

The students were asked to write in response to writing prompts that were carefully written so the audience and purpose were clearly expressed in each instance. The writing prompts were as follows:

Writing Prompt 1

Select a school rule and write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that it needs changing.

OR

Select a school rule and write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that it does not need changing.

Writing Prompt 2

Write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that there should be more school holidays.

OR

Write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that there should not be more school holidays.

Writing Prompt 3

Write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that American school children should go to school six days a week.

OR

Write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that American school children should not go to school six days a week.

Scoring

Student papers were scored holistically (see Appendix A). The holistic score here did not require an enumeration of any features, but it did take into account the purpose for the writing, its audience, and the degree to which the task was addressed. A 6-point scoring guide was used. The raters learned to use the scale by studying the high, mid, and low values, trying the scale on student-written products, and discussing the results. The raters evaluated the results independently. Scores ranged from 1 (low) to 6 (high). Because two raters scored each essay, the summed score for a given essay ranged from 2 to 12.

CLASSIFICATION OF PERSUASIVE STATEMENTS

Subjects

Two sets of student papers were used for this part of the study. One set was produced by the third- and fifth- grade students in the study reported above. [Note: Numbers may differ from reports of the prior study because all students who responded to one, not three, prompts, were included.] The second set of papers were produced by tenth- and twelfth- grade students in an earlier study, who had participated in a similar experiment without the oral interaction element, which also resulted in no significant main effects for treatment. For the coding of messages part of this study, there were 308 students: 108 in grade 3, 80 in grade 5, 48 in grade 10, and 72 in grade 12. One hundred forty-nine were boys and 159 were girls. All

students attended public schools in lower- to middle- class areas of southern California.

Writing Prompt

All students had written in response to the following prompt:

Write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that there should be more school holidays.

OR

Write a letter to the school principal to convince him/her that there should not be more school holidays.

Scoring

Each essay was read by a reader trained in the classification system of Weiss and Sachs (1991) (see Appendix B), which was based on a modified version of Falbo's (1977)) 16 strategies. Since the available literature on written composition contains so little information on the types of statements which children use to persuade, as much detail as possible is provided here. Falbo's categories, used only with adults before Weiss and Sachs' study, provide a strong framework for meeting this goal. Since this information may provide information to future researchers, the distribution of the kind of statements among the categories and types is given in Table 2. Some categories are used with low frequency, others not at all.

These categories were collapsed into 5 types, modeled after Wood, Weinstein, and Parker (1967) and Weiss and Sachs (1991). The types and their characteristics are as follows:

1. Norm Invocation: appeals to rules, fair play, and reason
2. Positive Sanction: offers of gifts or favors, bargaining, and politeness
3. Negative Sanctions: physical aggression, nagging, begging, and crying
4. Request: asking through the use of a statement or question
5. Assertion: forceful verbal assertions to achieve desires

RESULTS

INSTRUCTIONAL STUDY

The data were analyzed with Statistical Analysis System (1985) using the General Linear Model procedure. Since this is a nonorthogonal repeated measures analysis of variance, Sum of

Squares III is used. For the between subjects effects there were no main effects for Oral Interaction [$F(1,123)=.86$, $p>.05$] or for treatment [$F(3,123) = 1.17$, $p>.05$]. There was a significant main effect for grade [$F(1,123) = 5.05$, $p<.05$]. Follow-up Scheffe tests for the main effect of grade indicated that fifth graders wrote better papers than third graders for all three writing samples [see Table 2]. There were no significant interaction effects for oral interaction by treatment [$F(3,123)=.33$, $p>.05$], oral interaction by grade [$F(1,123)=.00$, $p>,05$], treatment by grade [$F(3,123)=.48$, $p>.05$], or for oral interaction by treatment by grade [$F(3,123)=.04$, $p>.05$].

For the within subjects effects, there was a significant main effect for time [$F(2,246)=3.45$, $p<.05$]. Follow-up tests indicated that students wrote better for both of the writing samples following the study than for the writing sample collected before the study started. There were no significant interaction effects for time by oral interaction [$F(2,246)=1.00$, $p>.05$], for time by treatment [$F(6,246)=1.38$, $p>.05$], for time by grade [$F(2, 246)=1.38$, $p>.05$], for time by oral interaction by treatment [$F(6, 246)=2.06$, $p>.05$], for time by oral interaction by grade [$F(2,246)=1.64$, $p>.05$], for time by treatment by grade [$F(6,246)=1.50$, $p>,05$], or for time by oral interaction by treatment by grade [$F(6,246)=0.93$, $p>.05$].

CLASSIFICATION OF PERSUASIVE STATEMENTS

The data were analyzed with a 2 (sex) x 4 (grade) design. Sex was male or female. Grades were three, five, ten, and twelve. Data were submitted to Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (1985). Sum of squares III was used since this was a nonorthogonal design. For the dominant message, there were no significant main effects for sex [$F(1,300)=.58$, $p>.05$]. There were significant main effects for grade [$F(3,300)=2.83$, $p<.05$]. There was no significant interaction effect for sex by grade [$F(3,300)=1.82$, $p>.05$]. For the use of one other message, there was no significant main effect for sex [$F(1,300)=.03$, $p>.05$]. There was a significant main effect for grade [$F(3,300)=4.50$, $p<.05$]. There was no significant interaction effect for sex by grade [$F(3,300)=.56$, $p>.05$].

The Effect of Age on the Use of Statement Categories

Follow-up Scheffe tests were conducted to determine where there were differences in the use of categories and types by age. Since a large number of tests were run on the categories, alpha was set at .005. It was determined that there was a significant difference in the use of two categories by age: Category 5 (Compromise) and Category 24 (Simple Statement). Category 5 was used significantly more by students in grade 12 than by students in grade 3. In fact, students in grade 3 did not use compromise at all while 11.1% of the twelfth grade students' responses were

compromise. Grade 5 students and grade 10 students used compromise less than grade 12 students but more than grade 3 students (grade 5 mean = 3.8%; grade 10 mean = 8.3%). Category 24, Simple Statement, was used significantly more by students in Grade 3 than by students in Grades 10 and 12 (alpha = .05) and in Grade 5 (alpha = .10).

Follow-up tests on the use of types results in similar findings. Type 3, Negative Sanction, was used more by students in Grade 5 (10.0%) than by students in grade 3 (.9%) or 12 (0) (alpha = .05). Grade 10 students' responses were of intermediate use (6.3%). Type 4, Request, was used significantly more by students in Grade 3 (38.0%) than by students in Grades 10 (12.5%) or 12 (15.3%) (alpha = .05) or in Grade 5 (22.6%) (alpha = .10).

There was also a significant increase in the number of kinds of statements made in the argument. Only 6.5% of the third grade students used a second kind of statement in their written arguments; no third grade students used more than two kinds of statements in their arguments. By Grade 5, 20% of the students use more than one kind of statement and 4.2% use more than two kinds of statements. In Grade 10, 39.6% of the students use more than one kind of statement and 4.2% use more than two kinds of statements. By Grade 12, 29.2% of the students use more than one kind of statement and 2.8% used a third kind of statement. Thus, with age students' arguments become more complex with the addition of different kinds of statements and types.

DISCUSSION

There were no significant effects for treatment or for oral interaction for the instructional intervention. This was a very disappointing result since the addition of the oral interaction component seemed promising by giving students additional opportunities and kinds of opportunities to practice persuading others. It seemed reasonable that giving students oral interactions with each other and with the teacher would help them develop argumentative skill. This was not the case. It should be noted that the oral interaction was of a recitation/discussion format. Future studies may investigate other kinds of oral interactions, such as role playing situations or simulations. Another possibility, especially for middle and high school students, is the formal teaching of debate and debate experiences. Although there are no significant main effects for treatment or for oral interaction, this study is important because it completes a line of research using strategies that are effective with other modes of discourse, specifically informational writing.

The analysis of the kinds of messages used by students at different grade levels gives a different kind of information from that of other studies on written persuasion. First, little

is really known about what makes a good persuasive argument. Even less is known about how to teach effective argumentation. What we do know from analyzing the kinds of statements in these written compositions is that third grade students have simple arguments with a larger percentage of requests than at other grade levels. Fifth grade students arguments are more complex than third grade arguments, but less complex than tenth and twelfth graders' arguments. Surprisingly, what is notable about fifth graders' arguments is that they use more negative sanctions than students at any other grade level. Tenth and twelfth graders' arguments are very similar in terms of complexity and kinds of statements used.

This study differs from others in identifying two categories by age of students' arguments. Third grade students' use of Simple Statements is notable, and probably is directly related to the lack of complexity of their argumentative skills. Twelfth grade students' use of Compromise is important because there appears to be a definite gradual addition of Compromise by grade to students' arguments. There are no third grade students who used Compromise in this study, only a few at grade five (3.8%), and more at grade ten (8.3%). More than ten per cent of twelfth grade students' responses are Compromise, which reflects a relatively sophisticated approach to negotiating an argument.

These students were working alone to produce an argument, as one always works alone when writing as opposed to having a conversational partner when participating in oral communication; and these students were writing to an adult audience, the school principal. It is possible they would use different strategies with the same task in oral communication or with a different task with written persuasion. What is obvious here is that there is a growing sophistication by grade of what works in making a written argument to an adult in a position of authority. By the end of high school, students are able to use different strategies from ones used in elementary school, ones that are more sophisticated than Simple Requests, but with few signs of overt aggression (Negative Sanctions).

REFERENCES

Anderson, H.E., & Bashaw, W.L. (1968). An experimental study of first grade theme writing. American Educational Research Journal, 5 (2), 239-247.

Applebee, A.N., Langer, J.A., & Mullis, J.V.N. (1986). The Writing Report Card: Writing Achievement in American Schools. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Applebee, A.N., Lager, J.A., Jenkins, L.B., Mullis, I.V.S., & Foertsch, M.A. (1990). Learning to write in our nation's schools: Instruction and achievement in 1988 at Grades 4, 8, and 12. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1982). From conversation to composition: The role of instruction in a developmental process. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology, Volume 2. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Clark, R.A., & Delia, J.G. (1976). The development of functional persuasive skills in childhood and early adolescence. Child Development, 1, 1008-1014.

Erftmier, T.A. (1985). Oral and written persuasion: Strategies of fourth-grade students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 1857-A.

Falbo, T. (1977). Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 537-547.

Flavell, J.H. in collaboration with Botkin, P.T., Fry, C.L., Jr., Wright, J.W., & Jarvis, P.E. (1968). The development of role-taking and communication skills in children. New York: Wiley.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (1984). What works in teaching composition: A meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies. American Journal of Education, 93 (1), 133-169.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). Research on written composition. Urbana: NCTE.

Knudson, R.E. (1988). Effects of instructional strategies on student writing. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside.

Knudson, R.E. (1991). Effects of instructional strategies, grade, and sex on students' persuasive writing. Journal of Experimental Education, 59 (2), 141-152.

Knudson, R.E. (1992). Analysis of argumentative writing at two grade levels. Journal of Educational Research, 85 (3), 169-179.

Knudson, R.E. (In press). The development of written argumentation: An analysis and comparison of argumentative writing at four grade levels. Child Study Journal.

Lemke, J. (1988). Genres, semantics, and classroom education. Linguistics and Education, 1 (1), 81-99.

McCann, T.M. (1989). Student argumentative writing: Knowledge and ability at three grade levels. Research in the Teaching of English, 23 (1), 62-76.

Pellegrini, A., Galda, L., & Rubin, D. (1984). Persuasion as a social-cognitive activity: The effects of age and channel of communication on children's production of persuasive messages. Language and Communication, 4, 285-295.

SAS User's Guide: Statistics, Version 5 Ed. (1985). Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute Inc.

Veal, L.R., & Tillman, M. (1971). Mode of discourse variation in the evaluation of children's writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 5 (1), 37-45.

Weiss, D.M., and Sachs, J. (1991). Persuasive strategies used by preschool children. Discourse Processes, 14, 55-72.

Wood, J.R., Weinstein, E.A., & Parker, R. (1967). Children's interpersonal tactics. Sociological Inquiry, 37, 129-138.

APPENDIX A
Guide for Holistic Scoring for Persuasive Writing

Score Point 1

Papers that attempt to address the topic but are general and vague. In general, they are not fluent, do not list or discuss reasons for an argument, and contain many errors in form. They are characterized by some of the following:

Score Point 2

Papers that respond to the task with some argument(s). Such papers are more fluent than the Score Point 1 paper and exhibit some development of logical reasoning.

Score Point 3

Papers that represent good attempts at developing a persuasive argument. The reader has no difficulty understanding the student's viewpoint.

Score Point 4

Papers that represent good attempts at developing a persuasive argument. The reader has no difficulty understanding the student's viewpoint. These papers are better organized that Score Point 3 papers.

Score Point 5

Papers that respond to the task with developed and substantiated reasons/appeals. These papers are well organized, fluent, and function as a unified piece of persuasion.

Score Point 6

Papers that address the topic, state and elaborate arguments, and exhibit logical thought. These papers are outstanding.

APPENDIX B

Categories and Descriptions

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
Acknowledgement	Student admits or recognizes another point, which may be followed by counterargument.
Appeal to Higher Authority	Student refers to person perceived as having higher authority in order to influence the audience.
Assertion	Verbally asserting one's way
Bargain	Explicit statement about reciprocating favors and making other two-way exchanges
Compromise	The student gives up part of his/her desired goals in order to attain part of them and assumes/argues audience will do/does the same.
Deceit	Attempting to deceive the audience by lying or concealing information or advocating that the audience use deception.
Defiance	Belligerent reply or strong negation of the audience's previous statements without supporting evidence.
Emotion-Agent	The student cries, screams, laughs, or uses other nonverbal means to reach goal.
Emotion-Target	The student attempts to alter the audience's emotions by distracting or playing up to him or her, or inducing feelings of guilt.
Fait Accompli	Openly doing what one wants without avoiding audience.
Force	Student expresses violence to influence audience or advocates that the audience use violence.
Guarantee	Offering assurances not in one's power.

Hint	Not openly stating what one wants; indirect attempts at influencing others.
Mitigation	Softening a previous statement by use of "please" in isolation.
Mitigated Simple Request or Mitigated Simple Statement	Use of "please" along with any simple statement or simple request.
Plead	Making a request in a begging manner.
Reason	Any statement using reason or rational argument to influence others.
Simple Request	A simple, polite request of one's desire.
Simple Statement	A matter of fact statement without supporting evidence or threats.
Thought Manipulation	Student turns the audience's anger around and directs it toward the audience or defuses anger by denying the audience's charges.
Threat	Stating or implying that negative consequences will occur if the student's plan is not accepted.
Why Challenge	Use of "why" in isolation or combined with another statement to challenge the audience's statement.

TABLE 1

Descriptive Statistics by Grade for
Writing Samples 1, 2, and 3

	Number	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3
Grade 3	73	3.53	4.21	4.25
Grade 5	66	4.35	4.83	4.74

Table 2

Types, Categories, and Frequency of Use by Grade for Dominant Strategy

Type		Category	Grade 3	Grade 5	Grade 10	Grade 12
1 Norm Invocation	1	Reason	45(41.7%)	35(43.8%)	23(47.9%)	42(58.3%)
	2	Why Challenge	4(3.7%)	3(3.8%)	0(0)	1(1.4%)
2 Positive Sanction	3	Acknowledgement	5(4.6%)	5(6.3%)	3(6/3%)	0(0)
	4	Bargain	2(1.9%)	0(0)	1(2.1%)	2(2.8%)
	5	Compromise	0(0)	3(3.8%)	4(8.3%)	8(11.1%)
	6	Emotion-Target	8(7.4%)	7(8.8%)	6(12.5%)	6(8.3%)
	7	Guarantee	0(0)	1(1.3%)	0(0)	0(0)
	8	Hint	1(.9%)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
	9	Mitigation	---	---	---	---
	10	Mitigated simple request	---	---	---	---
	11	Mitigated simple statement	---	---	---	---
3 Negative Sanction	12	Appeal to Higher Authority	0(0)	2(2.5%)	0(0)	0(0)
	13	Deceit	---	---	---	---
	14	Defiance	---	---	---	---
	15	Emotion-agent	---	---	---	---
	16	Force	---	---	---	---
	17	Fait accompli	---	---	---	---
	18	Plead	1(.9%)	0(0)	1(2.1%)	0(0)
	19	Threat	---	---	---	---
	20	Thought Manipulation	0(0)	6(7.5%)	1(2.1%)	0(0)
4 Request	21	Mitigated Simple Request	3(2.8%)	3(3.8%)	1(2.1%)	0(0)
	22	Mitigated Simple Statement	---	---	---	---
	23	Simple Request	---	---	---	---
	24	Simple Statement	38(35.2%)	15(18.8%)	5(10.4%)	11(15.3%)
5 Assertion	25	Assertion	1(.9%)	0(0)	2(4.2%)	2(2.8%)